

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of California

San Francisco Division

COPPER HILL, Inc.,

No. C 13-01345 LB

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER (1) CONTINUING THE JULY
25, 2013 CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE AND (2) TO SHOW
CAUSE RE: FAILURE TO FILE
JOINT CMC STATEMENT**

RENATO PAGTALUNAN, et al.,

Defendants.

On January 28, 2013, Plaintiff Copper Hill, Inc. filed a complaint against Defendants Renato Pagtalunan and Janette Cabauatan with the Superior Court for the State of California, County of San Mateo. Notice to Adverse Party, ECF No 6. On February 20, 2013, Defendants answered the complaint. *Id.* Then, on March 26, 2013, Defendants removed the action to this court. Notice of Removal, ECF No. 1.

On May 10, 2013, the Clerk of the Court notified the parties of their need to either consent to or decline the undersigned's jurisdiction. Clerk's Notice, ECF No. 6. Their deadline to do so was May 24, 2013. *Id.* The parties did not respond. *See generally* Docket. So, on June 6, 2013, the Clerk of the Court notified the parties a second time of their need to either consent to or decline the undersigned's jurisdiction. Clerk's Notice, ECF No. 7. This time, their deadline to do so was June 10, 2013. *Id.* Again, the parties failed to respond. *See generally* Docket.

In addition to failing to respond to the Clerk's Notices, the parties also failed to comply with the 3/26/2013 ADR Scheduling Order and this District's Civil Local Rules, which require the parties to

1 file a joint case management conference statement one week before any scheduled case management
2 conference. *See* 3/26/2013 ADR Scheduling Order, ECF No. 2 (requiring a joint case management
3 conference statement by June 20, 2013 (i.e., one week before the case management conference that
4 was previously scheduled for June 27, 2013)); N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 16-9(a) (requiring parties to file a
5 joint case management conference statement that complies with the Standing Order for All Judges of
6 the Northern District of California – Contents of Joint Case Management Statement), 16-10(d)
7 (requiring parties to file a joint case management conference statement no fewer than seven days
8 before any subsequent case management conference). The court notes that the parties did not file a
9 case management conference statements (joint or otherwise) before the case management conference
10 that was scheduled for June 27, 2013 (the court continued that case management conference because
11 of this failure) and have not filed a case management conference statement before the case
12 management conference currently scheduled for July 25, 2013.

13 In light of the failures described above, the court **CONTINUES** the case management
14 conference from Thursday, July 25, 2013, to Thursday, **August 22, 2013, at 11:00 a.m.** in
15 Courtroom C, 15th Floor, U.S. District Court, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California.
16 Furthermore, the court **ORDERS** the parties' counsel to show cause why they should not be
17 sanctioned for their failure to file a joint case management statement before either case management
18 conference. The parties' counsel shall do so by filing a written explanation no later than **August 1,**
19 **2013.**

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: July 24, 2013

22 
23 _____
24 LAUREL BEELER
25 United States Magistrate Judge
26
27
28